



Alaska Alternate Assessment

2012-2013

New Mentor Rater Proficiency & Protégé Review Accuracy

March 7, 2013

New Mentor Training

On October 15-17, 2012, Alaska educators seeking certification as Qualified Mentor-Trainers (QT) gathered in Juneau, Alaska. These Assessors-in-Training (AITs) participated in a three-day training that consisted of on-line training, large group training in Writing Scoring, web-based proficiency testing, peer-to-peer practice administration of sample alternate assessments and individual review of a sample protégé's test administration. The October training is designed to train participants to the Qualified Assessor level before requiring completion of tasks required to obtain Qualified Mentor-Trainer status. AITs were expected to complete all training and proficiency testing prior to joining the All Mentor Training in Anchorage at the beginning of November. There were 20 AITs who participated and 18 who successfully completed the training session. AITs who are new to the Alaska Alternate Assessment are required to administer practice tests and review a protégé's scoring of practice tests in order to earn Qualified Assessor status.

New Mentor Training – Practice Test Scoring & Recording Proficiency

Trainees administered the practice tests to other trainees. Each of the trainees administered one practice test in Reading, Writing, Mathematics and Science, as well as items from the ELOS Math and ELOS Reading practice tests. Each trainee was also evaluated on the overall administration of the practice assessments, called the protégé review. Trainees worked in pairs of two, identified in the dataset as teams. Teams were evaluated on a 4-pt scale, with 4 = Exceptional, 3 = Satisfactory, 2 = Needs Additional Work, and 1 = Unacceptable. There were seven categories rated, including: cover page accuracy, task administration, scoring of three tasks (one category each), clear marks recorded, and stopping the assessment at the appropriate time. This resulted in a total number of points possible of 28 (4 pts X 7 categories). The average team score was a 20/28, resulting in a 71% proficiency rating (range 10-28). This rating is just below the average rating that would be expected for a Satisfactory performance (i.e., 3 pts X 7 categories = 21).

Practice Test

All participant pairs turned in their practice tests on time. Eight of the 20 passed their practice tests on the first submission. Seven of the remaining AITs worked with DRA staff in order to pass on the re-submit round. Two participants decided not to move forward with the process for different reasons related to their local contexts. Both missed the November QT training where several AITs worked with DRA staff to complete requirements and eventually earn QT status. Overall results disaggregated by content area are reported below:

Content Area / Domain	Percent Accuracy
READING	77
WRITING	73
MATHEMATICS	80
WRITING	73
SCIENCE	73
ELOS	54
AVERAGE	71

Protégé Review

Fifteen participants passed their protégé review on the first attempt. Three more worked with DRA staff to pass the protégé review.

The protégé review consisted of the AIT reviewing scoring protocols of sample protégés with errors built into the samples. The AIT was rated on their accuracy in identifying errors in the protégé sample scoring protocols in the same seven categories listed above. However, the AITs were scored on a 2-pt scale: 1 = accurate and 0 = inaccurate. This yielded a total possible score for each AIT of 7 points. AITs demonstrated an average overall performance of 84% accuracy.

Content Area / Domain	Percent Accuracy
READING	81
WRITING	96
MATHEMATICS	93
SCIENCE	70
ELOS	89
SUMMARY REVIEW	75
AVERAGE	84

Eighteen of the 20 original participants completed the requirements necessary to become Qualified Assessors (QAs) as a result of the iterative training process. All of these participants also went on to become Qualified Mentor-Trainers (QTs) in Anchorage the following month.

Implications for Future Training – Practice Test Scoring and Recording Accuracy

The results from this year's training suggest that trainees who are new to the Alaska Alternate Assessment System continue to need significant support in gaining understanding of test administration and scoring requirements. With support, 83% of those trained passed all requirements. Two participants independently withdrew from the training process. While scoring and recording accuracy exhibited acceptable levels across reading, writing, mathematics, and science, it appears that some additional focus should be given to appropriate ELOS scoring and recording accuracy. ELOS results were scored at a 54% accuracy level, the lowest in this review.

Implications for Future Training – Review of Protégé's Test Administration

The results from this year's training suggest that participants need additional support in reviewing the science and writing scoring accuracy of their protégés. These results are atypical and unexpected, as science has historically been one of the easiest subject areas to score and review. Significant efforts have been poured into training in the area of administration and scoring of writing, as well. Because of other indicators, such as training evaluations from Annual Mentor, that suggest significant improvement in these areas, it is possible that this small group might not be representative.

Recommendations for System Improvement

The training regimen for new mentors is substantive and time consuming. While the training must remain robust, it is possible to make some procedures more efficient. In that vein, shortening the practice tests is recommended. This can be accomplished by including only one example of each type of item in each subject area and a range of item types across all grade bands. Each practice test scoring protocol should also include the General Instructions page describing examples of test accommodations and modifications. Concurrently, a new sample protégé packet should be created using these targeted practice tests.

Each participant should both administer the full set of targeted practice tests and pose as a student for another AIT for a full set of targeted practice tests. Written and verbal training instructions in New Mentor Training should more clearly highlight the importance of administering practice tests for participants in New Mentor Training and the importance of practice tests and reviews of protégé test administration when these New Mentors train future AITs.

New training modules for New Mentor training should include additional examples of ELOS items, with review of administration, scoring, and recording expectations to address the lower accuracy scores with regard to ELOS practice tests. Science and writing training materials should be reviewed for possible areas of improvement, related to the lower accuracy scores in the domains of protégé review.